

elaborately. Much of his work is done finally, but there are still left the reconstructive processes in which the minimum of undeniable fact reached by him shall be used as a critical criterion, or supplemented with other data to be gained by a less infinitesimal treatment of documentary material.

The fourth volume of the *Dictionary of the Bible* contains at least two articles of first importance in the New Testament field—that of Sanday upon “Son of God” and that of Driver upon “Son of Man.” It will be interesting to compare the corresponding articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, but one risks little in prophesying that they will not surpass these in method or probability of results. In the work of both Sanday and Driver we have admirable examples of a sane scholarship that recognizes difficulties, but knows also method and perspective. They, and not Van Manen, are the true representatives of the great current of critical scholarship; and if Sanday in the article mentioned is often overcautious, it is because he recognizes that historical method demands that reasonably good data are to be utilized and not declared non-existent.

The man who masters the contents of the *Dictionary of the Bible* may have to revise his opinions in the light of evidence therein contained, but he will find his confidence in the historical validity of the New Testament strengthened, and will never be tempted to mistake ingenious phantasy for scholarship or naive guesses for criticism.

GEORGE STEPHEN GOODSPEED.
SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE: A Study in Human Nature. Being the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion, delivered at Edinburgh in 1901–1902. By WILLIAM JAMES, LL.D., Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1902. Pp. 534. \$3.20, *net*.

It is safe to say that this is the most unconventional and the raciest treatment of the philosophy of religion which has yet appeared. As one reads the quaint characterizations of religious phenomena and the witty comments which they occasion he is inclined to question whether the author is not playing with his subject. He soon learns, however, if he did not already know it, that Professor James is constitutionally humorous, and that his aim in these lectures required him to exhibit

especially the abnormal and bizarre manifestations of religious sentiment.

The work is mainly occupied with the morphology of the subject ; in a later treatise the author promises to take up its philosophy more adequately. Here he aims to describe the phenomena "from the purely existential point of view." He will "handle them biologically and psychologically, as if they were mere curious facts of individual history." He then proceeds to review the various explanations of the phenomena, and by a process of sifting and testing prepares the way for an hypothesis of his own. Some of these characterizations are very amusing. For example, in reviewing the theory that religious experiences are only the product of certain diseased physical conditions, he says : " Medical materialism finishes up St. Paul by calling his vision on the road to Damascus a discharging lesion of the occipital cortex, he being an epileptic. It snuffs out St. Teresa as an hysteric, St. Francis of Assisi as an hereditary degenerate. Carlyle's organ-tones of misery it accounts for by a gastro-duodenal catarrh."

The test by which the author will measure the phenomena in question is that of utility. They cannot be tested by their supposed origin, because their origin is what we know the least about. No more can they be tested by argument and demonstration, because (as is shown in the latter part of the volume) they are not amenable to proof. In the end, then, we always come back to the "empiricist criterion : By their fruits ye shall know them, not by their roots." Religion is born and nourished in the warm atmosphere of feeling, and the final test of its truth is its agreement with our practical needs and its issue in wholesome and useful results in conduct and character.

There is a suggestive treatment of rationalism whose "inferiority in founding belief is just as manifest when rationalism argues for religion as when it argues against it." Under the caption "The Religion of Healthy-Mindedness," the modern metaphysical healing and Christian Science movements receive a sympathetic and illuminating discussion from a psychological, and to some extent from a theological, point of view. The lectures on "The Sick Soul" and "Conversion" canvass what theology calls the doctrines of sin and salvation. The naturalistic optimism of "healthy-mindedness" our author calls the "once-born type" of religion, while the theory that there is something radically wrong with human nature is the "twice-born type." As between these the author's judgment is :

The method of averting one's attention from evil and living simply in the

light of good is splendid as long as it will work. But it breaks down impotently as soon as melancholy comes. . . . Healthy-mindedness is inadequate as a philosophical doctrine, because the evil facts which it refuses positively to account for are a genuine portion of reality.

The phenomena and motives of asceticism — that “divine irrationality of devotion” — are fully illustrated and discussed. This type of “saintliness” is very complex, ranging all the way from St. Teresa’s “endless amatory flirtation” and St. Louis’s craving to be humbled by false accusations, to the noblest types of heroism and devotion. In mysticism Professor James believes that there is a deep truth, but the subjects of mystical experiences must not make them normative for those who are not susceptible to them. Philosophy may help to confirm religious beliefs when once they are *there*, but it can neither originate nor prove them.

What keeps religion going is something else than abstract definitions and systems of concatenated adjectives. . . . No one knows this as well as the philosopher. He must fire his volley of new vocables out of his conceptual shotgun, for his profession condemns him to this industry, but he secretly knows the hollowness and irrelevancy.

The closing lecture has suggestive remarks on the relation of æstheticism to religion. Newman is instanced as illustrating the type of mind which “needs formulas.”

Intoning them as he would intone a cathedral service, he shows how high is their æsthetic value. It enriches our bare piety to carry these exalted and mysterious verbal additions just as it enriches a church to have an organ and old brasses, marbles and frescoes, and stained windows. . . . The more venerable ecclesiasticism [of Catholicism] offers a so much richer pasturage and shade to the fancy, has so many cells with so many different kinds of honey, is so indulgent in its multiform appeals to human nature, that Protestantism will always show to Catholic eyes the almshouse physiognomy.

The author’s general conclusions are stated with great brevity and reserve, and we must await the forthcoming volume, in which he has promised to develop them fully. For the present, being an empiricist and a pluralist, he is a “piecemeal supernaturalist.” He thinks there is *something there* “other and larger than our conscious selves.” “Anything larger will do, if only it be large enough to trust for the next step. It need not be infinite, it need not be solitary.” The Professor is, on the whole, a theist, but whether a monotheist or a polytheist, he has not fully decided. There is, then, something or other — anything large enough will do — which makes incursions through the

“subliminal door” into our conscious life. This is the rather succinct volume of dogma which the empirical philosophy of religion yields up to date.

GEORGE B. STEVENS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

EVOLUTION AND MAN HERE AND HEREAFTER. By JOHN WESLEY CONLEY, D.D. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1902. Pp. 172. \$0.75, *net*.

THIS little volume does not attempt to harmonize science and religion, but only to sketch, in the first part, the intimations of immortality which the doctrine of evolution supplies and, in the second part, the bearings of that doctrine upon certain leading biblical teachings. Very properly on the threshold we are met by the definition of evolution as a process and in its causal relations. The modification of Le Conte's definition is good in the way of condensation, but not good in its unwarranted restriction of the process in two particulars, namely, to the realm of organic nature only and to such changes only as are upward. What of inorganic nature and of degeneration? There is a wise discrimination between the process of evolution and the proposed explanations of the process. In the discussion of its causal relations our author finds that “theism is the only rational basis for evolution.”

The leading idea of the book may perhaps be stated in the following way: Dead matter has the capacity for the various forces of nature, which, however, cannot influence it except under appropriate conditions. In the process of evolution such conditions arise successively, and a new form of force from the Infinite Energy flows into the process and gives rise to a new stage. Mechanical forces became operative first, chemical forces next, then vital force [*sic*] in its lowest form, and then in successive stages mental, moral, and spiritual forces appeared.

Upon this basis, which does not quite free itself from the suspicion of being logical rather than historical, Dr. Conley discusses man's origin and place in nature, the psychical perfecting of man in the coming age, and life after death—at least of “every man who is in the way of growth.” Much of this discussion is suggestive and clearly and strongly presented. The chapters which follow, treating of the future body and the transition to the coming age, are not impressive. They show here and there traces of confusion and either less firmness of grasp on the body of scientific truth, or the dominance of ideas